

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

WALTER STEPHEN JACKSON, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CIV 87-0839 JP/KBM

LOS LUNAS CENTER, *et al.*,

Defendants,

and

THE ARC OF NEW MEXICO,

Intervenor,

and

MARY TERRAZAS, *et al.*,

Intervenors.

**ORDER ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL  
PLAINTIFFS TO RESPOND TO DISCOVERY**

THIS MATTER came before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Compel Plaintiffs to Respond to Discovery (*Doc. 1795*). A telephonic hearing was held on Friday, February 25, 2011. At the hearing, Plaintiffs notified the Court that they have withdrawn their work product objections with respect to the lists of names of the individuals who provided Plaintiffs with information. Plaintiffs stated that they have disclosed to the Defendants the complete list of names with respect to each interrogatory.

The Court carefully reviewed the motion, memoranda and the relevant authorities and Defendants' interrogatories and requests for production (RFP) and Plaintiff's 91-page answers

and objections as well. Having heard the arguments of the parties, and for the reasons stated at the hearing, I find that the answers at this stage of discovery are sufficient with the exceptions noted below.

Wherefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:**

(1) Plaintiffs will supplement their responses as necessary with the material or principal facts on which they rely where they have not already done so;

(2) Plaintiffs will have one week to clarify their answer, in writing, to Interrogatory No. 4 regarding “evidence of scientific validity” of the audit and will be bound to that answer;

(3) Regarding Interrogatory No. 5, Defendants will provide Plaintiffs with an electronic copy of the document necessary for Plaintiffs to identify factually the medical assessments Plaintiffs contend violated prevailing professional standards. Plaintiffs will have ten (10) days from the date they receive the electronic document in which to do so. Plaintiffs will also discuss with Ms. Story and Lynn Rucker why they found the medical assessment deficient and identify and provide the applicable prevailing standard. In all other respects, Defendants’ motion to compel is **denied**; and

(4) Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel as to Interrogatory and RFP No. 12 is taken under advisement at this time.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE